


Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/701,160	BARHAM ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Peter A. Hruskoci	1724		
All Participants:	Status of Application: _____		
(1) <u>Peter A. Hruskoci</u> .	(3) _____.		
(2) <u>Margaret Meta Brumm</u> .	(4) _____.		
Date of Interview: <u>18 November 2003</u>	Time: _____		
Type of Interview:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)		
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If Yes, provide a brief description: _____		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed: <i>Prior Art Rejections in the Prior Office Action dated 3-12-03</i>			
Claims discussed: 16			
Prior art documents discussed: <i>Prior Art of Record</i>			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: <i>It was agreed to amend claim 16 as shown in the Examiner's Amendment to patentably distinguish over the prior art of record in view of the test results shown in Table 3 on page 13 of the instant specification.</i>			
Part III.			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.			
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)		_____ (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)	